

REMARKS/ARGUMENT**Regarding the Claims in General:**

Claims 2-22 are presently in the application, with claims 2-10, 21, and 22 before the Examiner for consideration. Claims 11-20 stand withdrawn from consideration.

Regarding the Interview with the Examiner Held July 28, 2005:

Applicants' representative acknowledges with appreciation, the courtesy and assistance afforded to him during the interview on July 28, 2005. During that interview, the differences between the present invention as claimed, and the newly cited references, Nishiguchi, EP 0 431 637 (Nishiguchi) and Kurosawa et al. U.S. Patent 6,201,306 (Kurosawa) were discussed in detail. The Examiner agreed to give further consideration upon the filing formal response reflecting these discussions, and to provide a detailed response if he does not consider the application and condition for allowance.

All of this is accurately reflected in the Examiner's Interview Summary.

Regarding the Prior Art Rejections:

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejection based on the Nishiguchi and Kurosawa references. In both cases, the references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the distinguishing features of the invention, namely initiating detachment of the die from the film by contact at the corners of the die.

The technical effect of contacting the film substantially at the corners of the die concentrates a high interfacial peeling stress region along the edges and near the corners of the die. It also reduces the bending of the die and hence reduces the chances of die crack (see page 7 line 28 to page 8 line 4 of the specification).

With respect to Nishiguchi, the entire concept is different. As may be seen, for example, in figures 6 and 9b of the patent, detachment of chip 5 from adhesive layer 4 is initiated by irradiating the tape in a limited area and thereafter engaging the tape with conventional ejector pins to lift the tape and the die so that it can be engaged by a pickup device. The ejector pins do

not initiate the detachment. Moreover, Nishiguchi expressly teaches away from engaging the injector pins substantially at the corners of the die, as may be seen on page 5, lines 17-24 and lines 46-49 where the ejector pins are specifically stated to be displaced from the corners "by a distance of 5% or more of the length of a diagonal line of the square lower surface of the semiconductor chip 5".

Kurosawa likewise teaches away from initiating a separation of the die from the carrier tape substantially at the corners of the dye, as may be seen in figures 6b, 7a-7d, etc. In this connection, it is noted that there is no mention anywhere in Kurosawa that the ejector pins engage the tape under the corners of the chip, and in fact, as observed by the Examiner during the interview, the enlarged area of the pins, which is the inventive feature in the Kurosawa patent, alone teaches away from applying the separating force only substantially under the corners of the dye.

Claim 21, previously submitted as a replacement for claim 1 clearly expresses these distinctions as it requires that the ejector pins be:

operative to initiate detachment of a die from the film by
contacting the film under the die . . . substantially at the corners of
the die . . .

As it is believed to be clear from the discussion above that neither Nishiguchi nor Kurosawa meet this limitation, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is allowable over the references.

Claims 2-10 and 22 are directly or indirectly independent on claim 22 and are allowable for all of the reasons stated above. In addition, these claims recite features which, in combination with the features of their respective parent claims, are neither taught nor suggested in the references.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by Facsimile to (571) 273-8300 addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Lawrence A Hoffman
Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative
Lawrence A Hoffman
Signature
July 29, 2005
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence A Hoffman
Lawrence A Hoffman
Registration No.: 22,436
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

LAH:cw